



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,312	01/26/2001	Aya Jakobovits	511582000100	7650
36327	7590	05/04/2005		
AGENSYS C/O MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE, SUITE 500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130			EXAMINER FETTEROLF, BRANDON J	
			ART UNIT 1642	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/771,312	JAKOBIVITS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD	1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

Jakobovits et al.
Date of Priority: 01/26/2000

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The Election filed on March 24, 2005 in response to the Restriction Requirement of December 15, 2004 has been entered. Applicants have elected without traverse Group II, claims 11-15 and 39 in part, as specifically drawn to an isolated 84P2A9-related protein.

Because applicants elected without traverse, the restriction requirement is deemed to be proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are currently pending and under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 04/08/2002, 02/28/2003 and 2/10/2004 are acknowledged and have been considered. A signed copy of the IDS is attached hereto.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, see for example, page 14, line 17 and page 33, line 16. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are directed to an isolated recombinant protein comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, wherein the recombinant protein is encoded by a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1. However, neither the specification nor any art of record teaches what the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 is, how it functions, or a specific and well-established utility as claimed. The specification asserts (page 15, lines 28-29 and page 16, lines 1-18) that the polypeptides of the invention can be utilized to generate antibodies for use in detecting 84P2A9 overexpression or the metastasis of prostate cells and/or cells of other cancers expressing the gene. Thus, it is presumed that there is a correlation between the overexpression of the polypeptide and a particular disease state. Furthermore, the specification teaches (page 18, lines 15-17) that the proteins of the invention may also be used in the forensic analysis of tissues of unknown origin.

The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-tumor activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are “useful” to the chemical arts when this term is given its broadest interpretation. However, the court held that this broad interpretation was not the intended definition of “useful” as it appears in 35 U.S.C. §101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediately apparent or fully disclosed “real world” utility. The court held that:

The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. . . . [u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where *specific* benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field. . . . a patent is not a hunting license. . . . [i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.

Although the specification discloses a nexus between the polynucleotide expression and a disease state (see for example page 75, Example 3), the specification does not disclose a correlation between any specific disorder and an altered level or form of the claimed polypeptide. If a molecule such as the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 is to be used as a surrogate for a disease state, some

disease state must be identified in some way with the molecule. There must be some expression pattern that would allow the claimed polypeptide to be used in a diagnostic manner. Many polypeptides may be expressed in normal tissues, as well as diseased tissues. Therefore, one needs to know, e.g., that the claimed polypeptide is present only in cancer tissue to the exclusion of normal tissue. Thus, in the absence of any correlation between the claimed polypeptide with any known disease or disorder, any information obtained from various expression profiles in both normal and diseased tissue only serves as the basis for further research on the observation itself.

Furthermore, those of skill in the art recognize that over expression of a particular nucleic acid specific for a tissue type, does not necessarily correlate nor predict equivalent levels of polypeptide expression. There are many steps in the pathway leading from DNA to protein, and all of them can, in principle, be regulated. For example, Alberts *et al.* (Molecular Biology of the Cell, 3rd edition, 1994, page 465) illustrate post-transcriptional regulation of ferritin wherein the translation of ferritin mRNA into ferritin polypeptide is blocked during periods of iron starvation. Likewise, if excess iron is available, the transferrin receptor mRNA is degraded and no transferrin receptor polypeptide is translated. Lewin, B. also teaches (Genes VI, Oxford University Press, Inc., NY, Chapter 29, 1997) that a major control point for genes exists during the initiation of transcription by the interaction of the RNA polymerase with its promoter. Concurring with Alberts *et al.*, Lewin further acknowledges downstream control of gene expression since translation of mRNA in the cytoplasm is also a point of control. Also, with regards to tumor associated antigens, Fu *et al* (EMBO Journal, 1996, Vol. 15, pp. 4392-4401) teach that levels of p53 protein expression do not correlate with levels of p53 mRNA levels in blast cells taken from patients with acute myelogenous leukemia, said patients being without mutations in the p53 gene. Furthermore, Mallampalli *et al.* (Biochem. J. Vol. 318, 1996, pages 333-341) teach that the glucocorticoid, betamethasone, increased mRNA expression of cholinephosphate cytidylyltransferase (CT) as determined by RT-PCR and Southern analysis, but did not alter the levels of the CT enzyme as assayed by Western blotting (abstract, and page 339, 2nd column, 2nd paragraph). Finally, Lewin acknowledges that control of gene expression can occur at multiple stages and that production of RNA *cannot inevitably* be equated with production of protein. Thus, the predictability of protein translation and its possible utility as a diagnostic are not necessarily contingent on the levels of mRNA expression due to the multitude of homeostatic factors affecting transcription and translation. Therefore, absent evidence of the

polypeptide expression including the correlation to a diseased state, one of skill in the art would not be able to predictably use the invention in a way that constitutes a specific and substantial utility and as disclosed do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 as being useful.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 is indefinite because it recites the phrase “stringent conditions”. Stringent conditions are not defined by the claim (which reads on the full range of stringent conditions, that is from very permissive to very high stringency). Although the disclosure contemplates certain stringent conditions (pages 10 and 11), it does not provide a limited definition for ascertaining the requisite degree of stringent conditions sought in the claims and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention and would not be able to determine the metes and bounds of the claims.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 15 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In the instant case, the claims are inclusive of a genus of nucleotides that hybridize under stringent conditions to the nucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 1. Thus, the claims are broadly drawn to any and all naturally occurring DNA molecules that hybridize under moderately stringent conditions. This would include a substantial number of nucleic acids that do not possess any biological activity such as nucleic acids that have as little as 60% sequence identity with the claimed sequences as the specification teaches that nucleic acids having sequence similarity can be detected by hybridization under low stringency conditions and sequence identify under stringent hybridization conditions. Furthermore, the conditions under which the stringent conditions are set forth are not defined, as the specification (page 10 and 12) only sets forth preferable conditions equivalent to moderate and/or high hybridization. Thus, the claims are drawn to a **genus** of polynucleotides. However, the specification only reasonably conveys a polynucleotide set forth as SEQ ID NO: 1.

A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or by describing structural features common the genus that "constitute a substantial portion of the genus." See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997): "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNA, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus."

The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. With regards to hybridizing nucleic acids; however, it is noted that the specification does not appear to specifically teach an example wherein the isolated nucleic acids encoding SEQ ID NO: 2 were used under stringent hybridization conditions for the isolation of nucleic acids that encode functional 84P2A9 proteins. Further, the hybridization conditions as disclosed by the specification are not limiting and thus the claims read on the full range of conditions from low to highly stringent wherein the claimed hybridized polynucleotides read on polynucleotides that range from those that lack significant complementarity to those that are completely complementarity to the claimed complementary polynucleotide.

Further, there is no identification of any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polynucleotides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. Applicants should further refer to Example 9 of the revised interim Written Description Guidelines regarding hybridization language (see <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/written.pdf>).

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence. Therefore, only a polynucleotide consisting of the nucleotides set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1, but not the full breadth of the claims, meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Therefore, NO claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

Art Unit: 1642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF

Jeff Siew
JEFFREY SIEW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
4/29/05